



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,234	03/12/2004	Trent A. Shidaker	WUR 50656/USw/2	7528
62968 7590 06/24/2009 HUNTSMAN INTERNATIONAL LLC LEGAL DEPARTMENT 10003 WOODLOCH FOREST DRIVE THE WOODLANDS, TX 77380				
EXAMINER				
SERGENT, RABON A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/799,234

Applicant(s)

SHIDAKER ET AL.

Examiner

Rabon Sergeant

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

1. Claims 1, 3-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With respect to claim 1, applicants have amended the EO content per 100g of the polymer to be at least 0.0058 moles; however, applicants have failed to provide support for the end point amount of 0.0058 as it pertains to the full scope of the claims. It appears that the value has been taken from Example 7; therefore, the position is taken that support for this amount is limited to compositions that correspond in scope to those of Example 7.

With respect to new claims 18-20, support has not been found for the subject matter of the claims, as it pertains to the full scope of the reaction system encompassed by claim 1. Applicants have failed to explain how the subject matter is supported.

2. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The language of claim 18, "including, ... , the reaction system enables", is confusing and awkward, because the language does not read properly.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1 and 3-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dempsey et al. ('696) in view of Parks et al. ('176) or Mackey ('553 or '528) and further in view of Gillis et al. ('107 or '939).

Dempsey et al. disclose the production of molded polyurethane products, including SRIM products, wherein an internal mold release agent comprising fatty polyesters, that correspond to applicants' claimed fatty polyester, is utilized with a polysiloxane surfactant that corresponds to applicants' claimed poly(dimethylsiloxane)-polyoxyethylene surfactant. Dempsey et al. disclose this surfactant as L-6980. See example 1. Dempsey et al. further teach at column 8, line 16 that surfactants corresponding to those of applicants are preferred components of the composition. It is noted that applicants have amended the EO content per 100 g of the polymer to at least 0.0058 moles; accordingly, the position is taken, in view of the showings within applicants' declaration of January 25, 2007, wherein it has been established that the EO mole content of Example 1 of Dempsey et al. is as high as 0.0053, that the exemplified content is so close to that claimed, that one of ordinary skill would have reasonably expected the respective compositions to display the same properties. The logic for this position stems from the rationale set forth within the court

decision, *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). This position is bolstered by applicants' own Example 6, which shows that an EO content of 0.0052 moles per 100 grams of polymer yielded good mold release properties.

5. Dempsey et al. fail to disclose applicants' component c)ii), fatty acid; however, applicants' specifically claimed mold release agent comprising both a fatty polyester and a fatty acid were known to be useful internal mold release agents for RIM and SRIM polyurethane moldings at the time of invention. This position is supported by the teachings of Parks et al. and Mackey. Parks et al. disclose applicants' claimed internal mold release agent within the abstract; column 2; and column 3, lines 1-46. Mackey discloses applicants' claimed internal mold release agent within the abstract and columns 3 and 4. The references further disclose the use of surfactants. See column 7, lines 30-47 within Parks et al. See column 9, lines 18-20 within Mackey.

6. Since it has been held that it is *prima facie* obvious to utilize a known component for its known function and in view of the teachings within Parks et al. and Mackey to utilize a fatty acid component in admixture with a fatty polyester component to produce mold release compositions for SRIM polyurethane moldings, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to incorporate the claimed fatty acid into the mold release agent composition of Dempsey et al., so as to arrive at the instant invention. *In re Linder*, 173 USPQ 356. *In re Dial et al.*, 140 USPQ 244.

7. Furthermore, Gillis et al. disclose that the combination of polysiloxane surfactants with mold release agents comprising a fatty acid ester component yields a synergistic result in terms of the effectiveness of the mold release property in SRIM systems. See column 2, line 55.

While Gillis et al. fail to specifically disclose applicants' claimed surfactant and mold release agent, the position is taken that, since each of the disclosed mold release agents within Dempsey et al., Parks et al., and Mackey is derived from long chain fatty compounds, the mold release agents of these references are analogous to the mold release agent of Gillis et al. to the extent that one of ordinary skill would have expected them to yield comparable release properties to that of Gillis et al. Accordingly, one would have reasonably expected that the combined use of fatty compound based release agents and polysiloxanes would yield SRIM compositions having improved mold release, relative to compositions not employing these respective components in combination. Furthermore, since mold release properties have been linked to the polysiloxane surfactant, it stands to reason that increasing the amount of the polysiloxane surfactant would be expected to improve mold release properties; therefore, it would have been obvious to increase the amount of polysiloxane surfactant utilized thereby increasing the EO content contributed by the surfactant. It has been established that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

8. Applicants' response has been considered; however, the response fails to overcome the prior art rejection for the following reasons. Applicants have argued that Dempsey et al. describe their foam stabilizers as having a copolymer of ethylene oxide and propylene oxide attached to a polydimethyl siloxane radical and that it has not been found where the examiner has provided evidence that, at the time the embodiments of the present invention were made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have questioned the accuracy of Dempsey's description. In response, despite the mischaracterization of the disclosed L-6980 surfactant within the reference,

the surfactant was nonetheless clearly identified; therefore, it would have been within the purview of the skilled artisan to determine its true composition. Furthermore, despite the inaccurate description, the position is taken that a surfactant meeting the claimed surfactant is disclosed and used within example 1. This issue was addressed during the interview of April 21, 2009 between the examiner and applicants' representative, and applicants are directed to the Interview Summary of that interview for further discussion of this issue and the examiner's position.

9. Applicants further argue that the obviousness rejection has been rebutted by the showings within the examples of unexpected results in the form of high numbers of releases attributable to the features of the instant mold release agent composition. In response, the examiner has considered applicants' arguments and showings; however, they are insufficient to overcome the prior art rejection, because the showings are not commensurate in scope with the claims in terms, of reactant species and amounts. It has been held that the claims must be commensurate in scope with any showing of unexpected results. *In re Greenfield*, 197 USPQ 227. It has further been held that a limited showing of criticality is insufficient to support a broadly claimed range. *In re Lemin*, 161 USPQ 288. For example, each of applicants' examples employs two specific active hydrogen components, a specific polyisocyanate, and a specific blend of catalysts; however, applicants' claim 1 merely specifies a polyisocyanate composition and a polyfunctional isocyanate reactive composition. Accordingly, it is clear that applicants' examples are of insufficient scope to establish any probative showing of unexpected results for the full scope of the claims. Absent adequate evidence of unexpected results, the obviousness rejection has been maintained for the reasons set forth.

Art Unit: 1796

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.

/Rabon Sergent/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

R. Sergent
June 21, 2009